

Date: Mon, 4 Jul 94 04:30:08 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #295
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 4 Jul 94 Volume 94 : Issue 295

Today's Topics:

 900Mhz Part 15
 CW - THE ONLY MODE! (2 msgs)
 Existing regulations limit our advancement.

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 3 Jul 1994 14:53:30 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
dkrauss@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 900Mhz Part 15
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Karl Beckman (CSLE87) wrote:

: No, in fact spread spectrum is power limited BECAUSE it needs more
: bandwidth. You are definitely limmited to 1W ERP to minimize the
: interference problems for which you (as one of many secondary users) are
: totally responsible. And as for the commercial SS systems, they rely on
: having multiple routes to get a message from node A to node B, so antennas
: with directional gain are not useable.

Not all SS systems use multiple routing. I have designed and installed
several point-to-point and point-to-multipoint SS systems which use
yagis. By the way, the commercial SS radios are only good for a few miles
unless you can get really high. Trees really kill them. And they're
expensive. 800mw radios by Cylink are about \$2500.

--

dkrauss@netcom.com

Date: 3 Jul 94 11:27:25 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ulowell!
woods.uml.edu!martinja@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW - THE ONLY MODE!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CsALB5.G2n@srngenprp.sr.hp.com>, alanb@hpnmarb.sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom) writes:

> Doug Faunt N6TQS 510-655-8604 (faunt@netcom4.netcom.com) wrote:
>
> : I've been considering trying to learn to use a paddle left-handed, so
> : that I can keep a pencil in my right. Any opinions on this?
> : I haven't learned to use a paddle yet. I'm still working on copying
> : 13wpm.
>
> I am a right-hander who learned on a left-handed bug. (!) To this day,
> I can send with bug or keyer with either hand.
>
> But it's not as useful as you might think. I find it very hard to
> write and send at the same time, to the extent that I rarely even try.
> (No problem writing and receiving at the same time.)

I think Luck Hurder, KY1T, is on to something in his post in the policy news-group where he speaks of the pencil and paper trap.

Probably 80 percent of the time I am copying code I have a pencil in hand and am either taking notes or writing verbatim. However, when I run mobile cw I have to depend completely on the gray matter entrapped within my skull. Yeah, it's still there, had an MRI in '90 that proves it.

Wonder what others think here...wouldn't it be best to learn code by head copy and not paper & pencil copy? I know Luck alluded to using a computer and your favorite word processor, but then you would have to know how to type also. The COVOX idea seems sound enough though. But looking back, I wish I had been taught to copy without the aid of any external memory storage devices, other than for maybe jotting down notes for the sake of QSO continuity or something like that. Those of us who learned code the "old fashioned way" pencil & paper took a lot of hits when we'd miss a character. Later we learned how to just press on past those missed characters. I wonder how much less time would have been involved in getting the speed up to say 25 wpm or so if we had not gone that route?

It doesn't help that at test sessions we hand out paper and pencil and kinda force folks to copy that way. If they fail to attain a 70 percentile in answering the questions they may obtain credit for one minute of consecutive copy. What an incentive to copy with paper & pencil....and to copy verbatim.

Let's here from some of the cw experts out there. What are your ideas on this? You too Luck. I'm interested. Maybe we can compile some how to's to help those in the next code class. I'm quite familiar with the way *I* did it but would like input into how other did or would do it now.

Thanks a bunch, sincerely,

Jim, WK1V

Date: Sun, 3 Jul 1994 16:13:05 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcom6!
faunt@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW - THE ONLY MODE!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I'd love to be able to do head copy, since the writing takes a significant amount of energy and time, however, I can't get the sense of what's coming across. I can't get the sense of letters spelled out to me, either. I have to remember them and mentally picture them. So, head copying, although I can get the characters a little faster that way, even now, doesn't seem to work for me. I am visually oriented.

Also, while copying on a computer or typewriter could be faster and/or easier, I don't type very well either. I have to look at the keyboard, at least some. Maybe I should learn to touch-type, but my goal is learning CW.

BTW, does anyone have any hints on learning to "copy behind"?
73, doug

Date: Sun, 03 Jul 1994 22:24:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Existing regulations limit our advancement.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri) writes:

>Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:

>: Part 97.205 provides for 'ancillary' functions of a repeater. The autopatch
>: is an ancillary function of the repeater, thus being under part 97.205
>: inclusive. And may be 'controlled' over the input. Part 97.205 (d) allows
>: automatic control of a repeater. Arguably, repeaters are treated separately
>: under 97.205 and the restrictions of 97.109 (e) may not apply to repeater
>: stations.

>

>I have yet to see any discussion that allows a third party to control a
>repeater in automatic control.

How is that? Who is in control the third party or the Automatic Control
Operator? (Hint: The Automatic Control Operator is in control of the
repeater station the whole time.)

>Under the automatic control rule 97.109

>(e) there seems to be no way for the third party to signal the control
>operator to take the repeater out of automatic control and exert primary
>control.

The 'USER' making a 'forward' patch is NOT a control operator of the
repeater. The AUTOMATIC CONTROL OPERATOR is in control of the REPEATER
STATION during a 'forward' autopatch.

>An autopatch function is ancillary until a third party is involved. Just
>because an automatic control operator or repeater controller allows an
>ancillary function to take place does not rule out the consequences of
>the law.

This is true, however I believe you could argue the repeater section
(97.205) allows it irrespective of 97.109 (e)

>Agreed there is quite a lot of third party reverse patch traffic here in
>the san francisco bay area on multiple repeaters...I still wonder where
>the gray area of the law allows this wide spread practice.

>

>Maybe it is time to re-write 97.109 (e) to allow some of these practices.

Yes, if it prohibits reverse patches it prohibits 'forward' patches for
the same reason as the Automatic Control Operator is STILL in control of
the repeater transmitter.

This would also PROHIBIT the practice of allowing third party traffic,
originating on the input (A ham has is child or uncle use his mic to talk
to another ham), to use a repeater (being automatically controlled)! Unless
you allow that 97.205 (d?) allows the automatic control of voice repeaters
under all (normal) conditions including 'third party traffic'.

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23, 1775
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

Date: 3 Jul 1994 10:53:08 -0700
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ccnet.com!ccnet.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <070194232633Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<1994Jul2.215520.9763@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <070394123154Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:
: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

: >In article <070194232633Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

: >97.109(e) No station may be automatically controlled while transmitting
: >third-party communications, except a station retransmitting digital
: >packet radio communications on the 6 m and shorter wavelength bands.

: >It may be widely violated, but 97.109(e) is still on the books. Any
: >time a patch is in use, a real live control operator with the ability
: >to control transmission by some means other than by on the input channel
: >signals must be present at a control point.

: Part 97.205 provides for 'ancillary' functions of a repeater. The autopatch
: is an ancillary function of the repeater, thus being under part 97.205
: inclusive. And may be 'controlled' over the input. Part 97.205 (d) allows
: automatic control of a repeater. Arguably, repeaters are treated separately
: under 97.205 and the restrictions of 97.109 (e) may not apply to repeater
: stations.

I have yet to see any discussion that allows a third party to control a repeater in automatic control. Under the automatic control rule 97.109 (e) there seems to be no way for the third party to signal the control operator to take the repeater out of automatic control and exert primary control.

An autopatch function is ancillary until a third party is involved. Just because an automatic control operator or repeater controller allows an ancillary function to take place does not rule out the consequences of the law.

Agreed there is quite a lot of third party reverse patch traffic here in the san francisco bay area on multiple repeaters...I still wonder where the gray area of the law allows this wide spread practice.

Maybe it is time to re-write 97.109 (e) to allow some of these practices.

Bob

--

Bob Wilkins	work	bwilkins@cave.org
Berkeley, California	home	rwilkins@ccnet.com
94701-0710	play	n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

Date: 3 Jul 1994 15:30:58 -0500
From: news2.sprintlink.net!news.sprintlink.net!bga.com!bga.com!nobody@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <FAUNT.94Jul11181923@netcom4.netcom.com>,
<CsALB5.G2n@srigenprp.sr.hp.com>, <1994Jul3.112725.1@woods.uml.edu>intl
Subject : Re: CW - THE ONLY MODE!

Howdy.

I'm a big proponent of head copy myself. In fact, when I started getting the code down--after I learned what all the characters sounded like--that's the *only* way I copied it. I practiced with nothing more than a shortwave receiver. If you can copy some of the really bad cw (sorry, but it's true) that some people send, copying the stuff that they give you at the tests is easy. I guess it worked, too, because I copied solid 5wpm for my novice, and might've been able to go faster but don't know. Got my license. Made a couple contacts and did a lot of listening. By January when I took (and failed) tech and General, after being a ham for three months, I passed my 20 wpm. So I was one of probably only a few 20 wpm novices for about a month. :)

--

Buddy Brannan, KB5ELV	Mary had a little lamb.
(512)441-3246 (Home)	Her father shot it dead.
Internet: davros@bga.com	Now Mary takes her lamb to school
davros@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu	Between a piece of bread.

Date: Sun, 03 Jul 1994 12:31:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!spool.mu.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2v1in0\$c6a@ccnet.ccnet.com>, <070194232633Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<1994Jul2.215520.9763@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>In article <070194232633Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)
writes:

>>The FCC, as I understand it, considers these to be ancillary functions of
>>the repeater (like the patch) and can be restricted. The repeater is under
>>automatic control when a patch is made. Remember the person bringing up
>>the patch may not be and probably is NOT a control operator of the
>>repeater. They are accessing an ancillary function.

>

>97.109(e) No station may be automatically controlled while transmitting
>third-party communications, except a station retransmitting digital
>packet radio communications on the 6 m and shorter wavelength bands.

>

>It may be widely violated, but 97.109(e) is still on the books. Any
>time a patch is in use, a real live control operator with the ability
>to control transmission by some means other than by on the input channel
>signals must be present at a control point.

Part 97.205 provides for 'ancillary' functions of a repeater. The autopatch
is an ancillary function of the repeater, thus being under part 97.205
inclusive. And may be 'controlled' over the input. Part 97.205 (d) allows
automatic control of a repeater. Arguably, repeaters are treated separately
under 97.205 and the restrictions of 97.109 (e) may not apply to repeater
stations.

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

Date: 3 Jul 1994 22:59:11 -0500

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!gerald.cc.utexas.edu!curly.cc.utexas.edu!
not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun30.162157.1@woods.uml.edu>, <2v140a\$otr@news.iastate.edu>,
<FAUNT.94Jul1181923@netcom4.netcom.com>
Subject : Re: CW - THE ONLY MODE!

In article <FAUNT.94Jul1181923@netcom4.netcom.com>,
Doug Faunt N6TQS 510-655-8604 <faunt@netcom4.netcom.com> wrote:
>I've been considering trying to learn to use a paddle left-handed, so
>that I can keep a pencil in my right. Any opinions on this?
>I haven't learned to use a paddle yet. I'm still working on copying
>13wpm.

This can be a very useful skill and a lot of great CW men have mastered
it. Convention dictates that the dots are sent with the thumb and the
dashes are sent with the finger. Therefore the keyer paddle will be
configured differently whether you are sending left-handed or right-
handed.

Although you can wire the paddle however you want, following the convention
can make life easier if you ever are in a situation where you want to use
someone else's gear. Another useful side-effect is that if you learn to
send with either hand and follow the convention, then you will be able to
use an arbitrary keyer paddle no matter how it is wired.

--Trey, WN4KKN

Date: Mon, 4 Jul 1994 04:14:11 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!news.eecs.nwu.edu!solo.eecs.nwu.edu!
hpa@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <joejarreCrJLyn.8q6@netcom.com>,
<1994Jun20.224802.18841@toybox.raleigh.nc.us>, <2v1vpb\$27a@tadpole.fc.hp.com>
Reply-To : hpa@nwu.edu (H. Peter Anvin)
Subject : Re: Railroad track as an antenna?

Followup to: <2v1vpb\$27a@tadpole.fc.hp.com>
By author: rogerm@fc.hp.com (Roger Mitchell)
In newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
> Though I doubt that railroad track would make a good antenna, (Most
> of it that I have seen is pretty well grounded.) The overhead wire
> of our trolley line here in Fort Collins, Colorado makes an

> excellent long wire antenna when the street car is not in use. It is
> almost 2 miles long, very well insulated, and at least 20 feet off
> of the ground.
>

... and under a few kilovolts of tension. How do you keep THAT from
zapping your equipment?

/hpa

--

INTERNET: hpa@nwu.edu FINGER/TALK: hpa@ahab.eecs.nwu.edu
IBM MAIL: I0050052 at IBMMAIL HAM RADIO: N9ITP or SM4TKN
FIDONET: 1:115/511 or 1:115/512 STORMNET: 181:294/101 Allah'u'abha
Most inappropriately named startup command, winner: Microsoft Windows

Date: Mon, 4 Jul 1994 04:10:45 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!news.eecs.nwu.edu!solo.eecs.nwu.edu!
hpa@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <BM+yxAL.edellers@delphi.com>, <2uqe71\$djt@ccnet.ccnet.com>,
<2usr3v\$f5u@abyss.west.sun.com>
Reply-To : hpa@nwu.edu (H. Peter Anvin)
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

Followup to: <2usr3v\$f5u@abyss.west.sun.com>
By author: myers@bigboy.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers)
In newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
> [About reverse autopatches]
>
> >Show me the gray area of the law that allows a third party to
> >automatically control an amateur repeater station.
>
> Of course, the third-party operator is remotely controlling the
> repeater, not automatically controlling it. However, Bob is right...
>

I think the key here is that there is no way a third party can
generate a message out that the owner of the repeater has not
authorized in advance. I think a repeater can be considered under
automatic control as long as it doesn't let a third party deliver an
arbitrary message. In the example "reverse autopatch for N9ITP this
is WB9AET repeater" the owner of W9AET/R has programmed the repeater
and authorized it to broadcast my call sign. That would be ALL what
third party could do.

/hpa

--

INTERNET: hpa@nwu.edu FINGER/TALK: hpa@ahab.eecs.nwu.edu
IBM MAIL: I0050052 at IBMMAIL HAM RADIO: N9ITP or SM4TKN
FIDONET: 1:115/511 or 1:115/512 STORMNET: 181:294/101 Allah'u'abha
PGP public key available by finger to the above address.

Date: Sun, 03 Jul 1994 22:21:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <FAUNT.94Jul1181923@netcom4.netcom.com>,
<CsALB5.G2n@srngenprp.sr.hp.com>, <1994Jul3.112725.1@woods.uml.edu>i.oar
Subject : Re: CW - THE ONLY MODE!

martinja@woods.uml.edu (JJ Martin) writes:

>I think Luck Hurder, KY1T, is on to something in his post in the policy news-
>group where he speaks of the pencil and paper trap.

>

>Probably 80 percent of the time I am copying code I have a pencil in hand and
>am either taking notes or writing verbatim. However, when I run mobile cw I
>have to depend completely on the gray matter entrapped within my skull. Yeah,
>it's still there, had an MRI in '90 that proves it.

>

>Wonder what others think here...wouldn't it be best to learn code by head copy
>and not paper & pencil copy? I know Luck alluded to using a computer and
>your favorite word processor, but then you would have to know how to type also.
>The COVOX idea seems sound enough though. But looking back, I wish I had been
>taught to copy without the aid of any external memory storage devices, other
>than for maybe jotting down notes for the sake of QSO continuity or something
>like that. Those of us who learned code the "old fashioned way" pencil & paper
>took a lot of hits when we'd miss a character. Later we learned how to just
>press on past those missed characters. I wonder how much less time would have
>been involved in getting the speed up to say 25 wpm or so if we had not gone
>that route?

>

>It doesn't help that at test sessions we hand out paper and pencil and kinda
>force folks to copy that way. If they fail to attain a 70 percentile in
>answering the questions they may obtain credit for one minute of consecutive
>copy. What an incentive to copy with paper & pencil....and to copy verbatim.

>

>Let's here from some of the cw experts out there. What are your ideas on this?
>You too Luck. I'm interested. Maybe we can compile some how to's to help

>those in the next code class. I'm quite familiar with the way *I* did it but
>would like input into how other did or would do it now.

Jim,

I have asked several times for that information to pass along to the
people that listen to my 2-Meter practice. I got several responses but
lost most to a disk problem. I too would be interested in any 'hints and
tips' that I could pass along.

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775
==+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

Date: Mon, 4 Jul 1994 02:30:36 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <772994479snx@skyld.grendel.com>, <Cs8ELC.G80@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<1994Jul2.212915.9358@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, ò
Subject : Re: CW ... My view.

In article <1994Jul2.212915.9358@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary
Coffman) writes:
>In article <Cs8ELC.G80@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:

>>

>>You've just reinforced the 'old cost argument'; keys can be easily made
>>while no one I know has ever made a mic.

>

>Perhaps that has to do with your narrow circle of acquaintance.

If you were to bet that my circle of acquaintance does not include arrogant
braggarts your expectation would equal the expected gain.

>Certainly

>I made my first microphone before I made my first telegraph key (I already
>knew how to talk, I didn't yet know Morse encoding of alphabet). It's
>very simple.

Yes, and as a young pup I made my own speakers out of cardboard shoe
boxes - got the idea from dissecting a blown speaker. Wound a zillion turns

of magnet wire around a paper tube with one end glued to the shoe box top and the other end riding over a permanent magnet glued to the base of the box.

But I do not use these speakers in a stereo system and neither do you use your mics on the air.

Yet simple CW transmitters are being built by the hundreds (QRP newsgroup) and whether you like it or not, CW is still a very healthy part of amateur radio. And since it is a *first step* in applying theory to practice its place amongst the requirements for gaining HF privileges will remain for quite some time, as it should.

Jeff NH6IL

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #295
